27th March 1929]

Civil Justice

Management of minors' properties by the Official Trustee.

*1953 Q.—Mr. P. BHAKTAVATSULU NAYUDU: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Official Trustee is taking up appointments as guardian of properties of minors;

(b) whether any loss consequent upon his acting is to be borne by the Government;

(c) whether it is in the province of the Official Trustee to act as guardian of the property of the minors;

(d) in how many cases the Official Trustee of Madras is acting as guardian of the properties of minors;

(e) what are the estates in which the Official Trustee acts as guardian of the properties of minors and the values of the estates and the income out of these estates;

(f) whether the Official Trustee acts as guardian of the properties of Shanmugasundaram, a minor;

(g) whether the said Official Trustee before letting out properties of the said minor on leases for a long number of years invited offers publicly;

(h) if so, whether hand bills were circulated and if not, in what newspapers they were published;

(i) whether it is true that the said Official Trustee is acting as guardian of the property of the said minor without publicly calling for tenders and is entering into contracts for several years to the detriment of the estate;

(j) whether the Government will be pleased to lay on the table the correspondence of the circumstances under which the lease of coconut topes was made by the Official Trustee in the above matter;

(k) whether the Government have been put to any loss consequent upon his management; and

(l) whether the Government charge any commission for such management and if so, what was the income out of this estate?

A.—(a) *to* (c) There is nothing to prevent the Official Trustee acting as trustee in respect of the properties of minors. The hon. Member is referred to sections 7, 10, 12 and 15 of the Official Trustee's Act, 1913.

(d) *to* (k) The Government have no information.

(l) Yes; but the Government have no information in regard to the estate in question.

Forests

Appointments in Forest department between 1925 *and* 1928.

*1954 Q.—Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) the number of appointments both temporary and permanent made in the Forest department from 1st April 1925 to 30th April 1928 in the lower subordinate and superior grades of pay;

(b) the number of Indians, Anglo-Indians and Europeans that were appointed to those posts; and

(c) among Indians the number of Muslims appointed to each of the grades?

A.—(a) *to* (c) A report has been called for.

Creation of Forest Panchayats in Mohirri and Goomsur forests.

* 1955 Q.—Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state with reference to question No. 1442 answered on the 25th February 1929 regarding the creation of Forest Panchayats in Mohirri and Goomsur forests—

(a) whether the Government would place the report of the Forest department on the table wherein the department refuses to have unclassed forests in Ganjam district; and

(b) whether they are informed that there is no area in the whole of Mohirri and Goomsur forests to be kept under Forest Panchayats?

A.—(a) & (b) The report referred to is at page 3 of G.O. No. 703, Development, dated 12th May 1925, which has been placed on the Editors' Table.

Alleged petitions against the reservation of forests in Dharakota estate.

* 1956 Q.—Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) the number of petitions received from the ryots of Dharakota Estate (Ganjam district) against the reservation of forests in the said estate;

(b) whether any enquiry was made;

(c) if so, when and by whom;

(d) whether any complaints were received against the enquiry; and

(e) whether any statements were recorded by the enquiring officers?

A.—(a) Two.

(b) *to* (e) The Government have received a report from the Collector of Ganjam on one of the petitions. Further information has been called for.

Leasing of unreserved forests in Dharakota and other estates.

* 1957 Q.—Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government are aware of the fact that unreserved forests in the Dharakota, Kallikota and Atagada Estates (to which Madras Forest Act is applied) in Ganjam district are annually leased out in spite of rule 5 of the Forest Rules framed by the Governor in Council;

(b) whether they have seen the judgment in C.C. No. 137 of 1928 on the file of the Tahsildar Second-class Magistrate of Aska wherein it is stated that the unreserved Pakidy forest was leased out for Rs. 1,700 and whether a lease deed marked as exhibit 'F' was produced;

(c) whether a police charge sheet was filed in this case; and

(d) why the police took up the case?

A.—(a) *to* (d) The Government have no information but a report has been called for.